



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/712,685	11/13/2003	Evgeniya Freydina	10168-7080.19	9109

37462 7590 11/28/2006

LOWRIE, LANDO & ANASTASI  
RIVERFRONT OFFICE  
ONE MAIN STREET, ELEVENTH FLOOR  
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02142

EXAMINER

DRODGE, JOSEPH W

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1723

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/712,685

Applicant(s)

FREYDINA ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph W. Drodge

Art Unit

1723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 October 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 and 22-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 23-26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20, 22 and 27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 23-26 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 1723

This application contains claims 23-26 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in the Office Action mailed July 5, 2006. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

Art Unit: 1723

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-3 and 8-13 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hark patent 4,808,287 in view of Batchelder et al patent 6,126,805 (both newly cited). Hark discloses a system for producing treated water comprising introduction of a municipal water supply stream into a point of entry that may be considered to be the inlet to prefilter 1, intermediate treatment means of carbon filters and reverse osmosis units, and removal of undesirable species in electrodialysis (EDI) unit 9. It is stated that the voltage is controlled by a controller and electric current periodically reversed for the purpose of cleaning off contaminants that deposit on the electrodes (column 4, lines 38-50). Treated water is then distributed to points of use through pumps 23 and 25.

The claims all differ in requiring that the electrical current is maintained below a limiting current density to suppress hydroxyl ion generation. Batchelder teaches that EDI-containing water treatment systems are operated near or below the limiting current density, sometimes in combination with reversal of direction of the electric current (as in Batchelder) in order to mitigate the precipitation and deposition of minerals to contact surfaces (column 1, line 62-column 2, line 19 and column 4, line 42-column 5, line 2, etc.) Such actions are taught as reducing "water splitting" or formation of hydroxyl ions. It is noted that the water treated by Hark contains minerals among other contaminants (Hark at column 2, lines 33-45). More specifically, in column 8, lines 34-47 and column

Art Unit: 1723

12, lines 35-38 and 45-51, Batchelder explicitly teaches operating the anion exchange membranes of an electrodialysis or electrodeionizing device to have a reduced water-splitting capacity and to operate the cation exchange membranes of such device to have a relatively limited water-splitting capacity compared to enhanced water splitting membranes, with such objectives realized by limiting current densities [as required by claim 3].

Thus, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have controlled the EDI process in the Hark system by operating near or below the limiting current density to minimize water splitting, or formation of hydroxyl ions, as taught by Batchelder, to further limit the amount of precipitation occurring on the EDI surfaces and downstream of the device especially in the concentrating stream, so as to optimize the EDI operation in removal of salts and other contaminants.

For claims 2,8,9,12 the treated water is stored in reservoirs 22 and 24 under some degree of pressure may be pressurized , by way of pressure imparted by upstream pumps 7 and 19-21 and the reservoirs or tanks being maintained full of water (Hark at column 5, lines 44-46).

With respect to claim 11 and claims dependent therefrom including claims 12 and 13, Rela discloses the overall process as reducing level of all impurities by a factor of approximately 700 upstream of the electrochemical device, resulting in water having very high resistance or very low conductivity (column 11, lines 54-65 and column 12, lines 8-12, respectively). Rela stores water in reservoirs 22 and 24 for claim 12 and

Art Unit: 1723

measures impurity removal of the system (column 1, lines 55-65, etc.) to be able to calculate percentage of the impurities removed for claim 13.

For claim 27, treated and recycled water is mixed with water from the point of entry (upstream of pre-filtration unit 1) between activated carbon filter 2 and carbon filter 3.

Claims 4-7 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hark in view of Batchelder as applied to claims 1 and 11 above, and further in view of Rela patent 6,607,668 of record. These claims further differ in requiring measuring of at least one water property and controlling at least the EDI device based on such property. However, Rela teaches a water treatment system that includes prefilter, reverse osmosis and use of an EDI unit such as in Hark and in which various water properties are sensed/measured and sensed values are used by the controller to control flow rates of raw water, flow rates of the water being distributed to end use points, amount of current applied to the electrodeionization device and other system parameters (col. 4, l 43-67, col. 10. l 28-40). It would have been also obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated the monitoring and control taught by Rela, into the Hark system, so as to optimize overall performance of the water treatment system.

Claims 17,18, and 20-22 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hark in view of Batchelder (teachings of Rugh patent 4,102,752 having now been found to be cumulative and unnecessary).

Hark discloses a system for producing treated water comprising introduction of a municipal water supply stream into a point of entry that may be considered to be the inlet to prefilter 1, intermediate treatment means of carbon filters and reverse osmosis units, and removal of undesirable species in electrodialysis (EDI) unit 9. It is stated that the voltage is controlled by a controller and electric current periodically reversed for the purpose of cleaning off contaminants that deposit on the electrodes (column 4, lines 38-50). Treated water is then distributed to points of use through pumps 23 and 25. The treated water that is stored in reservoirs 22 and 24 is under some degree of pressure having been pressurized, by way of pressure imparted by upstream pumps 7 and 19-21 and the reservoirs or tanks being maintained full of water (Hark at column 5, lines 44-46).

The claims all differ in requiring that the electrical current is maintained below a limiting current density to suppress hydroxyl ion generation. Batchelder teaches that EDI-containing water treatment systems are operated near or below the limiting current density, sometimes in combination with reversal of direction of the electric current (as in Batchelder) in order to mitigate the precipitation and deposition of minerals to contact surfaces (column 1, line 62-column 2, line 19 and column 4, line 42-column 5, line 2, etc.) Such actions are taught as reducing "water splitting" or formation of hydroxyl ions. It is noted that the water treated by Hark contains minerals among other contaminants (Hark at column 2, lines 33-45).

Thus, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have controlled the EDI process in the Hark system by operating near or below the limiting current density to minimize water splitting, or formation of hydroxyl ions, as taught by Batchelder, to further limit the amount of precipitation occurring on the EDI surfaces, so as to optimize the EDI operation in removal of salts and other contaminants.

These claims also require the reservoir system being "fluidly connected" to the point of entry. The reservoir system of Hark is directly fluidly connected to the immediately upstream electrodialysis unit and indirectly fluidly connected to points further upstream including the potable water inlet point of entry to the entire system.

For claims 17, 21 and 22, the treated water stored in reservoirs 22 and 24 of Hark is under some degree of pressure may be pressurized, by way of pressure imparted by upstream pumps 7 and 19-21 and the reservoirs or tanks being maintained full of water (Hark at column 5, lines 44-46). Alternatively, the entire system that contains reservoirs 22 and 24 can be understood as being pressurized by pump 7 and other pumps. Also note that water discharged from Hark's electrodialysis unit must undergo "depressurization" prior to being drained, thus water proceeding through conduits 17 and 16 has not been depressurized.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hark in view of Batchelder and further in view of Rela.

These claims further differ in requiring measuring of at least one water property and controlling at least the EDI device based on such property. However, Rela teaches a water treatment system that includes prefilter, reverse osmosis and use of an EDI unit



such as in Hark and in which various water properties are sensed/measured and sensed values are used by the controller to control flow rates of raw water, flow rates of the water being distributed to end use points, amount of current applied to the electrodeionization device and other system parameters (col. 4, l 43-67, col. 10, l 28-40). It would have been also obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated the monitoring and control taught by Rela, into the Hark system, so as to optimize overall performance of the water treatment system.

Newly submitted claims 23-26 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: Claims 23-26 are directed to a method and apparatus of recycling water from and to a water reservoir, classifiable in class 210, subclasses 805 or 194, and would concern a new search in areas unrelated to that needed for the other claims and distinct different issues, since none of the other claims of record concern such recycling.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 23-26 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Applicant's arguments filed on October 10, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. It is argued that since Batchelder teaches to split water by operating electrodialysis systems at relatively high current densities. However,

Art Unit: 1723

Batchelder also teaches that certain portions of electrodialysis units may be operated so as to have relatively lesser water-splitting or hydroxyl ion creation, compared to alternative components. Specifically, in column 8, lines 34-47 and column 12, lines 35-38 and 45-51, Batchelder explicitly teaches operating the anion exchange membranes of an electrodialysis or electrodeionizing device to have a reduced water-splitting capacity and to operate the cation exchange membranes of such device to have a relatively limited water-splitting capacity compared to enhanced water splitting membranes, with such objectives realized by limiting current densities.

With respect to claims 17,18 and 20-22, arguments directed to Rugh are now deemed moot since teachings of Hark are now deemed sufficient to anticipate the limitation of water being stored in reservoirs 22 and 24 under some degree of pressure.

This Office Action is not made final, in view of the different grounds of rejection of claims 17,18 and 20-22, not necessitated by the Amendment.

Art Unit: 1723

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph Drodge at telephone number 571-272-1140. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wanda Walker, can be reached at 571-272-1151. The fax phone number for the examining group where this application is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either private PAIR or Public PAIR, and through Private PAIR only for unpublished applications. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have any questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JWD

November 19, 2006

*Joseph  
Drodge  
Primary Examiner*